

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

AS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/055,201 04/03/98 BROWN

W 933, P1/MXP/R

IM22/0702

EXAMINER

PATENT COUNSEL
LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT
APPLIED MATERIALS INC
P O BOX 450A
SANTA CLARA CA 95052

ZERVIGON, R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

18

DATE MAILED:

07/02/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/055,201	Applicant(s) Brown, W., Herchen, H., Welch, M.D.
	Examiner Rudy Zervigon	Group Art Unit 1763

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon

(3) Abegal Batchelder

(2) Ashok K. Janah

(4) _____

Date of Interview Jun 19, 2001

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

U.S. Pat. 5,137,701 to Mundt.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Janah phoned to suggest claim language that would read over the Mundt reference. Specifically, our discussion centered on how the flow path of Mundt and the present application are, as shown in respective figures, distinct. After consideration, the claim language does distance the Mundt reference from the present application however U.S. Pat. 5,468,356 to Uhm reads directly on the suggested claim language as shown by Figure 2. The after final amendment refaxed June 27, 2001 is not entered.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

RUDY ZERVIGON
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1763